

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** josephcouden@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 06, 2003 4:55 PM  
**To:** fcc@prd7.wynn.com  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 11/06/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Joseph Couden

<CONTACT-EMAIL> josephcouden@hotmail.com

<ADDRESS1> 18024 3rd ave nw

<CITY> Shoreline

<STATE> WA

<ZIP> 98177

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> ruling #02-230 is theft

the broadcast flag is theft

please reconsider what you are doing to the American people by doing this.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** gloria whitson [glowhit@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 06, 2003 10:02 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 6, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

gloria whitson  
6728 Blue Meadow Drive  
Fort Worth, TX 76132  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Joshua Petrillo [jpetrillo@dcpositive.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 06, 2003 8:55 AM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 6, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joshua Petrillo  
58300 Ash Road  
Osceola, IN 46561  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Joseph Askew [jaskew125@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 11:29 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 5, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joseph Askew  
2410 20th Ave  
Rock Island, IL 61201  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** ronny birdsong [r\_birdsong@cell1amarillo.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 6:44 PM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 5, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

ronny birdsong  
86n.fairmont  
amarillo, TX 79106  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** mikej@gsinet.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 3:53 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 11/05/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Michael Jung

<CONTACT-EMAIL> mikej@gsinet.net

<ADDRESS1> 105 Fiddlehead Lane

<CITY> Chester

<STATE> NH

<ZIP> 03036

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I strongly oppose NPRM 02-230. The broadcast flag would effectively result in theft, and goes against Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution. Combined with the DMCA, it would prevent works from falling into the public domain and would prevent citizens from owning and using fully functional computers for legal purposes.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Lewis Jones [lewisjones@mail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 3:40 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 5, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lewis Jones  
1310 Otter Creek Rd  
Nashville, TN 37215  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** dikdik2002@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 2:04 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 11/05/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Earle Dickey  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> dikdik2002@yahoo.com  
<ADDRESS1> 5915 48th SW  
<CITY> Seattle  
<STATE> PA  
<ZIP> 98136  
<PHONE> 206 923-2572  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> Serve the public, not Hollywood!. Ban the the broadcast flag.

--A Regular Voter--



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Corey Higgins [st3am3r@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 8:38 AM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 5, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Corey Higgins  
29646 Mark  
Madison Heights, MI 48071  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** w.paris@sbcglobal.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 05, 2003 12:03 AM  
**To:** Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** Broadcast flag please read.

"I am dissappointed to see the FCC adopt the Broadcast Flag. How much thought did you put into this before you made your desicion. Restricting the next generation of broadcasts is in no way to motivate consumers to even pay for the service of cable T.V. If something that i am paying for is being broadcasted into my house i can not see a reason to why i can not record it to watch at a later date. This flag violates the fair use act. I hope that the FCC will reconsider upon there decision about the Broadcas flag for the future of DTV."

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Raymond Schauer [ray@schauers.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 04, 2003 11:39 PM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Raymond Schauer (ray@schauers.org) writes:

I am dismayed to see the FCC adopt the Broadcast Flag. I am wondering if enough thought went into this decision. Adding restrictions to the next generation of broadcasts is in no way going to motivate consumers. If something is being broadcast into my home, and I am paying for it, I see no reason I should not be able to record it for later viewing. This flag blatantly violates the fair use act. I hope for the sake of the future of Digital Television, the FCC considers rescinding the Broadcast Flag.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.163.63.205  
Remote IP address: 67.163.63.205

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** jcasey@dcwis.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 04, 2003 9:00 PM  
**To:** Michael Copps; KM KJMWEB; Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** DEMINSKI & DOYLE SHOW

Willi Casey  
11334 Meadow Rd.  
Ellison Bay, WI 54210

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th St, S.W.  
Complaints and Political Programming Branch  
Enforcement Division, Mass Media Bureau  
Washington, DC 20554

This is a formal PROTEST to each of the 5 members of the Federal Communications Commission concerning the recent 4-1 vote to fine Detroit radio station WKRK a mere \$27,500 for the Jan. 9, 2002 broadcast of the "Deminski & Doyle Show."

I have read an extensive transcript of this broadcast provided by the Parents Television Council [provided below], and it is clear that this broadcast constituted prolonged, flagrant, reckless and irresponsible indecency.

This station's license should be revoked.

I agree with FCC Commissioner Michael Copps that a fine of just \$27,500 is a mere "slap on the wrist" especially considering the vast financial assets of WKRK's corporate parents, Infinity Broadcasting and Viacom.

To these corporations, \$27,500 is an insignificant amount of money and therefore no deterrent against future indecent broadcasts.

Infinity has already paid more than \$1.5 million in previous FCC indecency fines, and yet its stations such as WKRK continue to spew such indecency.

This new "slap on the wrist" fine will do nothing to reduce broadcast indecency. In fact, the FCC would be giving WKRK and other stations an implicit "green light" to continue broadcasting gross indecency without fear of the consequences.

As a tax-paying citizen whose interests the FCC is supposed to serve by enforcing the Federal law against broadcast indecency, I DEMAND:

☐ That the FCC immediately convene a new hearing to consider revocation of WKRK's broadcast license;

☐ That you vote FOR revocation of the license at such hearing;

☐ And that each of you notify me, personally, of the action you have taken in this case and will take in other cases of broadcast indecency to enforce the law. The days of ignoring broadcast indecency and non-enforcement of the law at the FCC must end NOW!

Sincerely,

Willi Casey

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** erica-list@unmediated.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 04, 2003 5:49 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 11/04/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Erica Mulkey

<CONTACT-EMAIL> erica-list@unmediated.net

<ADDRESS1> 124 Fifth Ave. Apt. 3

<CITY> San Francisco

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94118

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*

<TEXT> I oppose the "Broadcast Flag" proposal. The purpose of the FCC should be to protect consumer rights, but instead it's become a tool for the MPAA and other big business organizations. We are fed up.

The airwaves should belong to the people, and the people shouldn't be limited in how they can use them, or what equipment they can use.

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Joann Ellis [joann.ellis@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 04, 2003 3:34 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 4, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joann Ellis  
22 Eaves Mill Road  
Medford, NJ 08055  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Brian Kelly [briank94@bresnan.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 10:39 AM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 2, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Brian Kelly  
719 Yellowstone Ave  
Billings, MT 59101  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Claudius Stute [claudiusstute@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 10:34 AM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 2, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Claudius Stute  
21263 Thatcher Terr.  
Apt. 301  
Ashburn, VA 20147  
USA



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Paul Pratzner [paul@bozleyco.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 8:39 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 2, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul Pratzner  
532 Greenhill Ave  
Wilmington, DE 19805  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Paul Blakelock [opunwide@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 8:03 AM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 2, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul Blakelock  
124 Cindy Ave  
Newbury Park, CA 91320  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** David Hicks [klondikeaz@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 6:22 AM  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 2, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David Hicks  
4207 E Almeria Rd Apt 1  
Phoenix, AZ 85008  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** John Goldberg [goldberg3r@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 2:36 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

John Goldberg  
810 e8th Ave  
Sault Ste Marie, MI 49783  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** James McCormick [james\_mccormick@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 1:46 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

James McCormick  
1131 White Oak Ct.  
Fort Collins, CO 80525  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** William Eldridge [flexnskill@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 02, 2003 12:26 AM  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

William Eldridge  
1255 Mallard Pt. Rd.  
Wirtz, VA 24184  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Christopher Harjo [charjo@rapfire.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 11:13 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Christopher Harjo  
1701 W Meacham St  
Henryetta, OK 74437  
USA

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Alessandro Abate [sandro@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 11:11 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

November 1, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Alessandro Abate  
1291 Nightingale Ave  
Miami Springs, FL 33166  
USA



## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Conley@prd7.wynn.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 01, 2003 9:23 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230  
<DATE> 11/01/03  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO  
<NAME> Tyler  
<CONTACT-EMAIL> Conley  
<ADDRESS1> 1245 main street  
<CITY> los angeles  
<STATE> ca  
<ZIP> 90022  
<PHONE>  
<DESCRIPTION> \*NPRM-02-230 Comment\*  
<TEXT> hollywood should not be able to control the rights of the public!!!

1. NO copy protection is ever 100% secure for more than a VERY brief time. When this hardware-based protection is broken by criminals, what will consumers have to do? Buy ANOTHER piece of hardware with updated copy protection? Send their TV tuner in for a firmware update? This is not a practical idea.
2. Why should consumers have to bear the cost of copy protection that will ultimately be ineffective? What about all the people that already bought HDTV who now have to spend MORE to get full broadcast quality on HDTV if this system is approved? Make the industry pushing for these ill-conceived provisions reimburse the working-class people their decision will affect (early adopters of HDTV whose system will be obsoleted) for the cost of these hardware upgrades!
3. Analog broadcasts can still be recorded forever, and this hole will never be effectively plugged.
4. Consumers right to record broadcasts has been firmly established in the Betamax case. This is a stealth attempt by the industry to regulate what can and cannot be recorded, and is unappreciated.
5. How will this affect the emerging market for TiVo and similar devices. If a program is marked as "unrecordable" or "untransferrable", it would directly affect the functionality of these emerging devices that are the future of television viewing.
6. The costs of a "fully secure" system (HDTV, Tuner, DVD, etc) will be so prohibitive that people simply will not buy, further slowing the HDTV rollout and mass-acceptance. Consumers want choice, flexibility, and convenience. This system takes that away under the guise of "protecting" the content providers. It is NOT in the best interests of anyone but the content providers and is actually anti-consumer, taking away rights that have been established for more than 25 years.
7. Stronger enforcement of existing anti-piracy laws will do far more than anything the broadcast flag can do in the real world. Unfortunately, that shifts the burden of cost to the content providers and law-enforcement, who are more vocal about budget constraints than a largely unaware consumer population. However, if this is enacted, that consumer population will vote with their wallets and stall HDTV acceptance progress...agai